WA–Trans Steering Committee Meeting Notes
July 16, 2002

Attendees:

Member	Association	Representing
Tareq Al-Zeer	WSDOT NW Region Maintenance and Operations	WSDOT
Eric Jessup	Project Manager of the Strategic Freight Transportation Analysis Project	Freight
Nancy Tubbs	US Geological Survey Oregon Liaison	USGS
Dale Guenther	US Regional Ecosystem Office	Federal Land Management Agencies
Wendy Hawley	US Census Bureau	US Census Bureau
Ian Von Essen	Spokane County GIS Manager	E-911
Dave Rideout	Spokane County Engineers GIS Manager	East side local government
Roland Behee	Community Transit of Spokane County	Transit
Tami Griffin	WSDOT Geographic Services	WS-Trans (Project Manager)

Not Attending:

Member	Association	Representing
Dave Cullom	Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission	Utilities, Rail, WUTC
Dan Dickson	CRAB	CRAB
Jerry Harless (Andy Norton, alternate)	Puget Sound Regional Council	MPO's
Lisa Stuebing	Mason County GIS Manager	West side local government
Not filled		East side local government
Not filled		West side local government
Not filled	Department of Natural Resources	

Facilitator: Tami Griffin   Recorder: Elaine Minnaert

Agenda:
1. Introductions
2. Steering Committee Role in Project
3. "Rules of Engagement"
4. Business Needs Collected Prior to 11/01
5. WSDOT Business Needs Identified
6. Gap Analysis on Business Needs
7. Review Work Plan
8. Wrap Up

WA-Trans Steering Committee Meeting Notes
July 16, 2002

The meeting began with introductions and a discussion of the role of the facilitator and recorder during the meeting. Then the discussion centered on the view of the attendees of the <u>role of the steering committee</u> on the project and their role as steering committee members. Various responsibilities were brought up. These include:

1. *Sharing resources and data sharing.* Wendy Hawley indicated that Census can share in-kind services and equipment. Wendy can propose it and it may help a lot. It is against USCB policy to give money so funding is not available from this source. Because of the 2008 Tiger update for the 2010 Census there is a tremendous need for accurate data and WA-Trans could be a source. Others indicated the same ability to share in-kind resources.

2. *Funding, data integration coordination (interagency)* – Dale Guenther brought this up and indicated that he represents many groups and feels strongly that a major deliverable has to be development of a primary data model (not perfect, but good enough) and a determination of what is shared and what is critical. Based on integration of data WA-Trans should produce a "live" data set. This was summarized as a base map that is maintainable and sharable).

3. *Resource Definition* – The steering committee will help define what resources are needed and what are available.

4. *Input into the process* – having direct input into the process of developing WA-Trans

5. *Sharing unique expertise and resources with unique expertise* – it was recognized that each participant had unique experience to share.

6. *Representing Constituents* - It was also recognized that each represented some group or "constituency" and it was important to identify who that group was and publish it so that constituency would recognize that representative and be able to communicate with them. An action item was identified as a result of this.

7. *Development of a data model* - Dale Guenther brought this up and indicated that he feels strongly that a major deliverable has to be development of a primary data model (not perfect, but good enough) and a determination of what is shared and what is critical. Based on integration of data WA-Trans should produce a "live" data set. This was summarized as a base map that is maintainable and sharable).

8. Charter definition of steering committee roles include:
    a. *Assists with development and evaluation of business requirements and needs*,
    b. *prioritizes them*,
    c. *develops functional requirements for a particular set of deliverables*,
    d. *determines the scope of individual phases of the project*,
    e. *supports that scope with change management*,
    f. *provides issue resolution support.*

It was agreed that these aligned with the view of the group and the roles they listed.

Action Item -> Tami will add a paragraph to the web page regarding steering committee and whom the member represents. Tami will also send out e-mails to partners regarding this so they know who their representatives are.

The next item discussed was <u>rules of engagement</u> for the steering committee during meetings and regarding action items. Individual items discussed include:

- Steering committee membership size and transition process
- Documentation of steering committee on web page
- Decision making process
- Documentation of decisions
- Commitment to attendance and using an alternate
- Action items (commitment)
- Preparedness

It was decided that the <u>decision making process</u> was the most important item of those on the list. Various options were discussed including defining some level of agreement such as if 70% of the member approve a decision carries or having a goal of 100% consensus and using cards to show levels of support or using the five finger voting method. Another proposed method was consensus baring violent objection. This was discussed at some length. What was agreed to was:

1. Check to see if the group has enough information to make a decision
2. Make sure there is adequate time for discussion of options, etc.
3. Make decision by show of hands in support of proposed option
4. Determine if the outcome is one the group can live with. If not have more discussion and determine if there is a fall back position.
5. Have a final vote.
6. Document the decision. It was agreed that decisions would be documented in the meeting minutes. The minutes will be typed up and send out to participants to make sure they are accurate. Then they will be posted on the web for all to see.

Action Item -> Tami will make sure notes are distributed to members soon after the meeting. Members will let Tami know of any changes and then notes will be posted to our website.

The next item discussed was <u>commitment</u>. Commitment was discussed in relationship with:

- attendance,
- having an alternative attend meetings,
- action items

- preparedness.

The first item discussed was <u>attendance</u>. Tami expressed her view that all members attend every meeting and if they can't attend they have an alternate representative identified to attend the meetings in their place. She also said she had identified monthly meetings for this group. However these meeting should be based on the work plan and the work this group should do. Sometimes there may be less of a need to meet and sometimes more. This lead to a discussion of location and the use of video conferencing. Dale suggested that while video conferencing is not the ideal way to attend meetings of this sort (discussion and decision making as opposed to presentation) that he will need the use of video conferencing if is to be possible for him to attend all the time. It would also be easier if the meeting weren't always held in Olympia. It might be better if some could be held in locations closer to some participants occasionally. An action item was set up to explore this. Another suggestion was to consider conference calls to follow up on action items. This might be appropriate in some situations. This item was put in the parking lot.

Action Item -> Members will look in their own area for meeting facilities (possibly with video conferencing) so we can rotate meeting locations. They will bring information back at the next meeting.

It was difficult to determine level of commitment without looking at the work plan. Making a commitment to attend required knowing how much time it was going to take. Dale suggested not meeting more than every 6 weeks. There was also some discussion about revisiting decisions made because a member was absent. It was agreed that absence wasn't a good reason to revisit a decision. However sometimes a decision may be revisited due to other circumstances. It was decided to table the discussion of attendance until after the discussion on the work plan.

The idea of identifying an <u>alternate</u> was discussed. It was agreed that an alternate was a possibility and that the members much commit to making sure the alternate is prepared for the meeting. This includes understanding their role, action items and preparation required. The use of our website will be helpful for bringing alternates up to speed. An action item was developed regarding this.

Action Item -> Tami will build a steering committee section of the website with the membership and representations defined, "rules of engagement", roles and responsibilities, and meeting notes in one area.

Commitment to <u>action items</u> was discussed. It was agreed that Tami would send action items out with the notes and that members would have until the next meeting to complete them. If the participant couldn't finish them they would let Tami know **at least one week**

prior to the next meeting that they would not be able to complete the action item so alternate plans could be made.

Commitment to <u>preparedness</u> was discussed. Tami agreed to send out agendas and other documents at least a week prior to the meeting so the members could be prepared. The attendees agreed to read the materials and come to the meetings prepared to discuss and make decisions.

Steering committee <u>membership size and transition</u> plan was discussed. It was agreed that the existing size and membership for the steering committee was fine. However Tami did ask for help in identifying possible member to take the two remaining East/West local representation places. Dave indicated that it was important the membership be obtained by first asking for participation from a group requiring representation, then using the responses to gauge interest. If multiple agencies volunteer, the Steering Committee should choose the agency which would best represent the group, and ask the agency to select their representative. Where possible this will be the method used to solicit new involvement. It was understood that there may be changes in participation over time and that there may be expertise we are missing to do our jobs and make the best decisions possible. There are two solutions for those instances. One is to bring people in for a short time as needed to take advantage of their unique expertise for solving a particular problem or making a particular decision. The second option is to transition a member out and bring a new member in. It was agreed that it would be best if there were a transition period, but until we know the circumstances, planning specifically how we would do that transition is difficult.

Action Item -> Members provide Tami with suggestions to fill last two positions.
Action Item -> Tami contact Cathy Udenberg of Walla Walla County regarding participating in the steering committee. 509-526-3287.

The discussion turned to <u>business needs assessment</u>. Dan Dickson's paper was distributed. Because of the lack of time to send it out in advance there was not much detailed discussion. It will be posted at our website. Tami explained the basis for the paper was a difference of opinion she and Dan had about whether a business needs assessment had already been done. Tami expected that Dan would be providing a paper about the work already accomplished and business needs already collected. The paper was about the work already accomplished and had little about business needs in it. However, Dan does make a case for not doing further analysis (ex. business needs assessment) and moving forward with a pilot.

The group discussed whether any more business needs should be gathered. Dale felt that OGIC (Oregon Geographic Information Council) had done business requirements and these should be considered. He is hesitant to begin because it takes a lot of effort. Dave indicated that in his memory of the previous charter they did feel there was a plan to do a pilot next and this seems like a step back to him. Ian felt that you couldn't get funding with out business drivers documented. He said it shows the efficiencies in the investment. Homeland security is a big driver. Tami stated the same and also stated that business needs can be used for finding new funding and making project decisions. Eric felt that the business needs document that Tami had begun was a good start and that each individual could take it back with them and determine what was missing based on their own constituency. He proposed that everyone send Tami updates and the document be updated for discussion prior to the next meeting. We can get it done soon that way. The group agreed and an action item was documented.

Action Item –> Dale will get OGIC requirements and make sure they are covered in the document.

It was also decided that the group should rank the priority of each business needs identified in the final document prior to the next meeting. The raking will be done based upon the value (or usefulness) of the business need to the represented constituency. A discussion of ranking criteria was discussed. The following ranking criteria were decided upon.

> 1 – No business value
> 2 – Limited business value
> 3 – Nice to have
> 4 – Very important but not critical
> 5 – A must have (show stopper for participation)

Action Item –> Each member will take the document and evaluate it for completeness and whether it represents the business needs of the constituency they represent. They will use the format in the document provided to document missing needs or other items. These will be sent to Tami by August 12 (Monday). Tami will compile them into one document and return to the group by August 19 (Monday) a week prior to the next meeting (August 26). Each member will then rank them based upon the ranking criteria provided prior to attending the meeting on August 26.

The next item discussed was whether all groups that need to be included in the business needs assessment are included by the process. Ian indicated that there is a need to spread the focus beyond those who operate the transportation infrastructure to those who use it and maybe those who use it in unexpected ways. Ian felt very strongly that the

Department of Health should be contacted because they have made a big investment in geocoding based on roadways and we might get some valuable information from them. Dale indicated that the goal of the IRICC was to produce integrated coordinated centerline work because it is very useful to a lot of groups beyond the agency generally producing it. There was some discussion of how far we should go with the business needs assessment. We could spend some time on groups that have needs that really are beyond the scope of WA-Trans. Tami proposed that she could contact those groups and gather their needs but her time is limited. She proposed developing a prioritized list of those who aren't included in the existing process and then she would start at the top priority and go down until she ran out of time. That was agreed to.

The list developed was:

- Tribes and Bureau of Indian Affairs (NOT the same but handled together) (priority 3 tied)
- Federal Military (priority 3 tied)
- Municipalities (priority 1)
- Health Department (priority 2)
- Academia
- Ecology
- Federal Highways (priority 3 tied)
- FEMA

It was agreed that members would provide Tami with contact information for those groups. Action items were documented.

Action Item -> Tami will start with municipalities and then health and begin setting up meetings with representatives from these groups and will work on it until the group deems the business needs done. Where possible the group can make these contacts.

Action Item -> Nancy and Dale will get contact information to Tami regarding tribes and BIA.

Action Item -> Ian will send Tami contact information for the Health Department.

Action Item – > Eric will give Tami contact information from the Association of Washington Cities and other contacts that may be useful.

Action Item – > Nancy will give Tami contact information about Donna Wendt from the City of Tacoma.

*Action Item – >*Roland will either provide contact information or will contact himself the cities of Bellingham and Bellevue.

Action Item – > Members will give Tami appropriate contact information to complete contact with groups not represented where possible.

Action Item – > Dale will contact the Forest Service, BLM and Parks Service.

The next topic discussed was the <u>work plan</u>. Tami provided an overview of the process she used to develop the plan, particularly Phase III. Phase III was based upon the pilot project Oregon did in Wasco County. Very detailed labor documentation was kept for that project. Tami used that information along with Washington counties population data to develop some thresholds and set up some multipliers based on population to come up with the hours for Phase III. She also used tasks from that pilot. It needs to be understood that this phase will change once Washington has done pilots. Phase II is pilots. Each pilot is based on the Dueker/Bender white paper proposal. However they are not scheduled because at this time we don't have the resources to do them. Also the Forest Plan Monitoring Pilot was included but isn't scheduled.

Phase I is the section the Tami wanted the groups input on. Tami walked the group through that phase. There was some discussion on requirements that will follow business needs. Tami mentioned what she called "test cases" is really criteria to evaluate if WA-Trans does what it is supposed to and should be based on business needs. But since business needs include things we won't build into WA-Trans we will base the criteria on the requirements. Nancy agreed to provide the information from the early ORBITS effort (Oregon).
Action Item -> Nancy will look at the old ORBITS work and see if they are incorporated in the document.

There was also discussion about <u>cost benefit</u>. Tami discussed some of the research she has seen and that it is polygon based and doesn't work for vector based system such as transportation. More research should be done on ways to determine B/C. Many partners and potential partners are very interested in this. It will be difficult because WA-Trans is only part of the solution. Applications have to be built on it to actually meet the business needs. Nancy pointed out that much of the value to the USGS (using National Map as an example) is intangible. The partnership formed is one of those. There was some discussion of looking at what other states are doing. Also it would be good to determine what it is that will really "sell" to get participation and use.

Tami asked if there was something <u>missing in the tasks</u> that needed to be added to Phase I. Dale identified the need for an "umbrella" data stewardship agreement that covered roles and responsibilities. This would be a multi-task item between "determining the goals of agreements" and "writing sample agreements". Tami will add it to the plan. There is also a set of project management tasks that don't seem to be scheduled properly.
Action Item -> Tami will add the Data Stewardship Agreement tasks to the plan and change the dates on the project management tasks.

The group discussed when next to meet. It was decided that the meeting would be on August 26 in the same place and same time. Tami will set it up.
Action Item -> Tami will schedule a meeting for August 26 from 9 a.m. – 2 p.m.

A review of the meeting was done. The positive items are listed in the + column and the items that should be changed are listed in the Δ column.

+	D
Valuable discussion	Afraid we wouldn't get it all done
Meeting moved well	Location for meeting should be rotated
Good time was kept	
The detailed agenda with time provided was helpful	
Good organization	

The parking lot included one item that hadn't been discussed. That was the use of telephone calls for action items. Also not completed was a schedule for future meetings. Both items will be put on the parking lot.